



Section 6.0

ALTERNATIVES



6.0 ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall describe “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” as well as provide an evaluation of “the comparative merits of the alternatives.” “An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to the project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation.”

This section describes several potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them as required by CEQA. Each major issue area included in the detailed impact analysis (see Section 4.0, *Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, of this EIR) is included in the analysis of the alternatives. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), “the EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.” CEQA also requires EIRs to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the alternatives (including the proposed project). A matrix comparing the various project alternatives and their anticipated environmental effects before mitigation is applied is provided as a summary at the end of this section.

As described in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, the project would have project-specific significant environmental effects on the following issues: cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality and paleontological resources. All project-specific significant environmental effects would be mitigated to below a level of significance with measures identified in Section 4.0 of this report. The proposed project would contribute considerably to cumulatively significant transportation/traffic impacts. The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would also be mitigated to below a level of significance through the implementation of a mitigation measure identified in Section 4.0 of this report. The proposed project would have no significant and unmitigated project-specific and/or cumulative impacts.

The basic project objectives that these alternatives should strive to achieve are listed in Section 3.3 of this report.

It should be noted that CEQA does not compel a Lead Agency to adopt an alternative that is less environmentally damaging than the proposed project, but only to identify feasible alternatives that could avoid or substantially lessen the project's significant environmental effects. The State

Legislature declared in CEQA that "in the event specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof" (Public Resources Code Section 21002).

6.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

6.1.1 Description of Alternative

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B), the No Project Alternative is the “circumstances under which the project would not proceed,” as discussed above under Section 6.1. It can also be defined as what would be “reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved” based on current plans. This No Project Alternative assumes that the proposed SP would not be adopted, the current SDP proposal would not be implemented, and no expansion of the existing Plaza Camino Real shopping center would occur. Under the No Project Alternative the project applicant would re-tenant the currently vacant Robinsons-May department store under the existing Precise Plan (PP 24) that currently governs development on site. Under the Precise Plan, the 148,159 square feet (sf) of vacant department store space could be occupied by new permanent tenant(s) without additional discretionary approvals by the City of Carlsbad. Thus, it is reasonable to assume the entire 1,151,092-sf shopping center would be operational in the foreseeable future under the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the proposed SP would not be adopted, the current SDP proposal would not be implemented, and no expansion of the existing Westfield Carlsbad shopping center would occur. Revitalization of the shopping center through the reconstruction of the former Robinsons-May department store and construction of new out-buildings proposed as part of the current SDP proposal would not occur. Any signage improvements would be implemented in accordance with the Carlsbad Municipal Code with no deviations. Under the No Project Alternative, the former Robinsons-May department store would be re-occupied with commercial/retail tenant(s). Interior tenant improvements would be permitted but no construction of new buildings or square footage or increase in building heights would occur. No façade treatments would be implemented around the exterior of the vacant department store. The landscaping along the El Camino Real corridor and Marron Road would not be widened under this alternative.

6.1.2 Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternative to Proposed Project

Aesthetics

Any changes to the exterior of the existing shopping center, including the main mall, movie theater, parking areas and street frontage, would be in accordance with the Municipal Code (rather than the proposed SP which features development standards that are specific to the Westfield Carlsbad Shopping Center). As noted above, the architecture and landscape enhancements proposed as part of the SP and current SDP proposal would not be implemented. Existing views of the SP area would continue to feature an internally-focused regional shopping center ringed by paved surface parking and limited ornamental landscaping if proposed project is not approved. Under the No Project Alternative, no improvements to the El Camino Real corridor, which is considered the northern “gateway” into the City, would be implemented. Although the existing shopping center generally conforms to the El Camino Real Corridor Development Standards in terms of landscaping and signage, it does not enhance the corridor’s scenic qualities because it features one out-building, minimal landscaping, bulky signage and expansive surface parking areas within 300 feet of the road ROW. Similar to the proposed project, no scenic resources would be affected by the No Project Alternative. The long-term aesthetic benefits to visual character and quality of implementing comprehensive development regulations and design guidelines would not be realized under the No Project Alternative. Potential increases in light and glare associated with new sources of night lighting, such as parking lot standards, would not be substantial or cause significant effects. Less than significant aesthetic impacts would occur under the No Project Alternative, similar to the proposed project; however, the beneficial effects of the proposed project would not be realized if the No Project alternative is implemented.

Air Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, limited construction emissions would be produced from the Westfield Carlsbad site related to tenant improvements. Short-term increases in criteria pollutants emissions associated with construction phase of the proposed project, including building demolition, new construction and paving, would be avoided by this alternative. Operational emissions related to traffic, energy usage, and water usage at the existing center have been accounted for in historic monitoring data collected for San Diego County (see Table 4.2-2) but would be less than the proposed project. As a result, no significant air pollutant emissions impacts would be caused by the No Project Alternative, similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would avoid the potentially significant impact of the proposed project caused by the disturbance of buried (but unknown) cultural resources during proposed excavation or grading. Should resources exist beneath the developed portions of the site, they would stay intact and would not be disturbed as grading would not occur under this alternative. Mitigation related to construction monitoring would not be required under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, this alternative would not result in potential impacts to cultural resources and no mitigation would be required.

Energy

Under the No Project Alternative, energy usage would not change since the baseline conditions described in Section 4.4, *Energy*, assumed the entire center would be using energy.

Limited amounts of fossil fuels and electricity would be used if future tenant improvements occur. No short-term energy usage associated with building demolition, grading operations, new building construction and new paving would occur. While limited energy conservation could be realized if any internal renovations are implemented under this alternative, it would not achieve the same level of conservation as a more extensive, more efficient structure(s), as proposed. Less energy demand would be realized under this alternative; however, impacts would remain less than significant.

Geology and Soils

No new construction would be implemented on site; thus no new structures would be exposed to seismic-induced hazards, including ground rupture, ground shaking, or liquefaction/settlement. The existing shopping center would, however, remain located in an area mapped by the County as having geologic hazards, such as liquefaction potential. The No Project Alternative would avoid potentially significant project impacts due to seismically-induced ground shaking and liquefaction/settlement, as well as compressible/expansive soils, shallow groundwater, oversized materials and foundation/footing design issues.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the No Project Alternative, new construction GHG emissions would be limited to the minor construction activities associated with tenant improvements. No short-term

GHG emissions would be associated with demolition, grading operations, new building construction and new paving. Interior renovations conducted on the existing department store structure would not be required to comply with 2008 Title 24 or the CALGreen building conservation standards. Regulatory reductions in vehicular GHGs would occur as emissions reductions are realized by fuel efficiency standards promulgated by the state and federal governments. The No Project Alternative would not cause significant contributions to cumulative GHG emissions in the future, similar to the proposed project.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials

Tenant improvements within the Robinsons-May department store building would likely result in the disturbance of some ACM and/or LBP, but less than under the proposed project which would be a more extensive renovation including removal of the existing roof. Therefore, this potentially significant impact would be less than the proposed project but would still occur under the No Project. Mitigation identified for the proposed project would be applied under the No Project Alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Westfield Carlsbad shopping center would continue to contribute runoff to the Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon watershed and the Pacific Ocean. Similar to the proposed project, existing drainage patterns and directions would remain unchanged. Instead of a net decrease in impervious surfaces (and runoff) achieved through the proposed installation of pervious pavement and landscaping, the runoff rates from the shopping center would stay the same. No short-term construction impacts to water quality related to erosion/siltation and other sources of degradation would occur under the No Project Alternative since grading would not be implemented. Urban contaminants would continue to accumulate in the parking areas and drainage facilities and be transported off site. No improvements to long-term water quality would be realized under the No Project Alternative because treatment control BMPs and LID improvements, such as bio-swales, irrigation controls and porous pavement, would not be implemented on site. Because new construction would not occur, potentially significant impacts to water quality related to short-term construction activities and long-term operations would be avoided by this alternative. Mitigation would no longer be needed to address water quality.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, no land use incompatibilities would occur under the No Project Alternative since the regional shopping center use would be continued. The No Project Alternative would not be entirely consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element objective to create a visually appealing form of the shopping center for residents. The existing shopping center would be consistent with the Circulation Element goals for the community through its connection to regional roads and alternative public transportation opportunities, although it would not enhance the El Camino Real corridor as encouraged by the Scenic Corridor Guidelines embodied in the General Plan. The No Project Alternative would be consistent with the Noise Element. The No Project Alternative would not increase the site's implementation of the Public Safety or Arts Elements of the General Plan nor would it be inconsistent with stated goals. The existing shopping center would be entirely consistent with the Carlsbad Zoning Ordinance and relevant portions of the Carlsbad Municipal Code. Since no new growth would occur under the No Project Alternative, conflicts with the Growth Management Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance and the Local Facilities Management Plan would not occur (similar to the proposed project). In addition, the No Project Alternative would not affect the ability of the City to implement its HMP for local biological resources, including the Buena Vista Lagoon Ecological Reserve. As noted above under *Aesthetics*, although the existing shopping center conforms to the El Camino Real Corridor Development Standards in terms of landscaping and signage, the No Project Alternative would not enhance the corridor's scenic qualities, which would be inconsistent with the development standards for the road. However, no significant land use impacts would be produced by this alternative, similar to the proposed project.

Noise

Construction noise attributable to general equipment and demolition would be avoided by this alternative since only interior improvements would be implemented. The existing Westfield Carlsbad shopping center would continue to generate roadway and parking lot noise, and HVAC equipment noise. No new stationary noise sources would be produced by the No Project Alternative as it is assumed the existing HVAC systems and parking lots would not substantially change upon re-tenancy of the vacant commercial space on site nor would there be any exterior restaurant noise generated at the existing center since no new out-buildings would be constructed. Some of the existing noise-sensitive receptors in the area would continue to experience noise levels which exceed the City and County, as described in Section 4.10. As shown in Table 4.10-9, traffic noise associated with the No Project Alternative is accounted for in the Existing Conditions baseline described in Section 4.10, *Noise*. Similar to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would continue to produce noise but would not result in significant noise impacts.

Paleontological Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, no grading would occur on the Westfield Carlsbad shopping center site, so there would be no potential to disturb paleontological resources contained in on-site formational materials. As no grading would be required to re-tenant the former Robinsons-May department store, no construction monitoring would be needed. Therefore, potentially significant impacts to sensitive fossil resources would be avoided by the No Project Alternative.

Transportation/Traffic

Under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that the currently vacant Robinsons-May department store building would be re-occupied by other super-regional commercial tenant(s). Under the No Project Alternative, the Existing Baseline condition reported in Section 4.12.1 of this report assumed the re-tenancy. As shown in Tables 4.12-1 through 4.12-3, the daily LOS on all 18 street segments in the project study area would continue to operate acceptably (i.e., LOS D or better) if the No Project Alternative were adopted. Although all 10 street segments in the City of Carlsbad would operate acceptably during the peak hours, two street segments in the City of Oceanside would operate at LOS E or F during peak hour under the Existing Baseline conditions (see Table 17 in Appendix F). All 18 intersections would operate acceptably under the Existing Baseline conditions. These conditions are generally similar to the existing traffic conditions observed in the field in 2009-10. No additional traffic would be produced under the No Project Alternative. Future indirect cumulative impacts to the three roadway segments in the City of Oceanside would not be avoided by this alternative since those locations are predicted to operate poorly in the future without the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems

The fully operational shopping center (with the vacant space re-occupied) would not increase demand for potable water and would not produce more sewage during dry weather and peak wet weather conditions, as the demand from the existing shopping center is accounted for in the baseline analysis conducted for the proposed project. Storm drain facilities would continue to convey runoff off site and into the floodway for Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon. The amount of solid waste produced on site would not change and it would continue to be collected and disposed of by Waste Management at the Otay and Sycamore Landfills, which have sufficient capacity to continue handling existing solid waste from the site. As there are no existing infrastructure inadequacies identified in the project area, no significant impacts would occur under this alternative, similar to the proposed project.

6.1.3 Conclusion

Under the No Project Alternative, potentially significant impacts to cultural resources, geologic hazards, hydrology and water quality, and paleontological resources on site would be avoided since new construction would be limited to interior tenant improvements. Similar to the proposed project, less than significant impacts would occur for air quality, aesthetics, energy, land use and planning, noise, and utilities/service systems for this alternative. Hazards and hazardous waste impacts caused by asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint would still occur under this alternative due to on-going shopping center renovations. The traffic associated with this alternative would contribute to indirect cumulative impacts to three roadway segments in the City of Oceanside in the future, although the contribution would not be considerable. The No Project Alternative would not meet most of the basic project objectives outlined in Section 3.0 of this report. For instance, the No Project Alternative would not modernize or expand the shopping center into a contemporary facility since only the existing, internally-focused structure would be used for new commercial retail. No new standards for landscaping, parking, uses, signage or building design would be implemented. No new or enhanced dining or entertainment experiences or outdoor gathering places or pedestrian-friendly site design or connections would be created. Less construction and commercial jobs, shopping opportunities and sales tax base would be generated by the No Project Alternative since no new commercial space would be constructed on site. An improved street presence would not be realized, including an enhanced streetscape for El Camino Real, a visual “gateway” into the City. Although some sustainability features could be integrated into the existing shopping center, the potential to decrease the shopping center’s existing GHG emissions would be lower under the No Project Alternative. Improvements in long-term water quality would not be realized since treatment control measures would not be constructed.

6.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – REDUCED PROJECT: MAIN MALL RENOVATIONS ONLY (NO OUT-BUILDINGS)

6.2.1 Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 2, substantial renovations to the 148,159-sf former Robinsons-May department store and adjacent 77,472 sf of retail shops, including new commercial construction along the façade of the structure, would be implemented under a SDP. However, the pads for the three out-buildings (26,300 sf) would not be constructed as proposed. As such, Alternative 2 would result in a net 9,117-sf increase in the amount of new GLA proposed on the Westfield Carlsbad property (in contrast to the 35,417 net sf of new retail space proposed under the project)

(as shown in Table 3-1). None of the parking area would be reconfigured under this alternative. The development standards, design criteria and guidelines and implementation procedures contained in the Westfield Carlsbad SP would be adopted. Similar to the proposed project, future SDPs would have to comply with the provisions and procedures in the SP.

6.2.2 Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternative to Proposed Project

Aesthetics

The main mall and adjacent retail shops would be updated in accordance with the SP and SDP; however, the adjacent parking areas, would not change since no new out-buildings would be constructed. The architecture and landscape treatments proposed as part of the current SDP proposal would be implemented on and around the eastern end of the mall and along El Camino Real and Marron Road. Views from the east of the SP area and shopping center would feature an externally-focused regional shopping center ringed by paved surface parking and enhanced landscaping. Although the main mall is set back more than 300 feet of El Camino Real corridor (beyond the scenic corridor defined for that road), reconstruction of the department store, addition of new commercial space on the exterior of the department store structure, and installation of new landscaping would indirectly enhance the corridor's scenic qualities by improving the look of the shopping center when viewed from the east. Similar to the proposed project, no scenic resources would be affected by this alternative. The long-term aesthetic benefits to visual character and quality of implementing comprehensive development regulations and design guidelines would be realized under the Alternative 2. Potential increases in light and glare associated with new sources of night lighting, such as new parking lot lighting, would occur, although impacts would not be significant similar to the proposed project. Less than significant aesthetic impacts would arise as a result of Alternative 2 similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Under Alternative 2, new construction and operational emissions would be produced from the reconstruction of the former Robinsons-May department store and adjacent retail shops. Short-term increases in criteria pollutants emissions associated with the project construction phase, including demolition, new construction and paving, would still occur but would be below the levels anticipated with the proposed project. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a decrease in long-term operational emissions related to natural gas combustion, landscaping, architectural coating and vehicles, since the amount of net new GLA on site would be reduced to 9,117 sf. Similar to the proposed project, a violation of the

CO standards, resulting in a CO hotspot near local intersections would not occur. Because the proposed project would not exceed stated significance thresholds, significant air pollutant emissions impacts associated with Alternative 2 would also not be significant since it would allow for less development. Incremental contributions to cumulative air emissions would still occur.

Cultural Resources

Potential project impacts to unknown cultural resources contained on site would be lessened under Alternative 2, but not avoided since grading would still occur along the exterior of the main mall structure as part of the project. Potentially significant impacts would still be expected under Alternative 2 and monitoring would still be required, similar to the proposed project.

Energy

Energy demands associated with Alternative 2 would be less than the proposed project since nearly 26,300 fewer commercial sf would be developed. Substantial enhancements in the energy efficiencies for the main mall would be realized under this alternative, compared to the existing conditions, due to the on-site renovations that would be implemented under Alternative 2 that would have to comply with Title 24 and CALGreen building code requirements. The amount of construction-related energy usage would be less than under the proposed project. Less than significant impacts to energy would arise under Alternative 2, similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

The potential for impacts from geologic hazards, such as seismic-induced ground rupture, ground shaking, or liquefaction/settlement would be similar as for the proposed project. With less construction under this alternative, the potential impact would be slightly less than the proposed project. However, Alternative 2 would not avoid potentially significant project impacts due to seismically-induced ground shaking and liquefaction/settlement, as well as compressible/expansive soils, shallow groundwater, oversize materials and foundation/footing design issues since all new construction would have to address these hazards.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under Alternative 2, short-term construction GHG emissions would be limited to emissions associated with main mall renovations and would be less than anticipated for the proposed project because the parking areas would not be demolished to make way for the out-buildings.

Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would decrease long-term GHG emissions that would occur as the project's demand for electricity, natural gas, and water consumption would be reduced and less traffic would be produced under Alternative 2 from levels anticipated under the proposed project. Renovations conducted on the main mall structure would comply with Title 24 and CALGreen building conservation standards and, thus, would reduce future GHG emissions, in accordance with AB 32 goals. Regulatory reductions in vehicular GHGs would naturally occur as emissions reductions are realized by fuel efficiency standards promulgated by the state and federal governments. Thus, although Alternative 2 would increase existing GHGs produced on site, no significant contributions to cumulative GHG emissions would occur in the future.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials

Renovations and/or reconstruction within the Robinsons-May department store building and adjacent commercial space would likely result in the disturbance of ACM and/or LBP at similar levels as the proposed project. Therefore, this potentially significant impact would be the same as the proposed project. Mitigation identified for the proposed project would be applied under Alternative 2.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Westfield Carlsbad shopping center would continue to contribute runoff to the Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon watershed and the Pacific Ocean. Similar to the proposed project, existing drainage patterns and directions would remain unchanged. A net decrease in impervious surfaces (and runoff) would be achieved through the proposed installation of pervious pavement and landscaping, although the decrease would be less than under the proposed project. Potential short-term construction impacts to water quality related to erosion/siltation and other sources of degradation would occur under the Alternative 2, although less construction would lessen the impact as compared to the proposed project. Urban contaminants would continue to accumulate in the parking areas and drainage facilities and be transported off site. Improvements to long-term water quality would be less than the proposed project because fewer treatment control BMPs and LID improvements, such as bio-swales, irrigation controls and porous pavement, would be implemented on site without the out-buildings and the improvements associated with their development. Potentially significant impacts to water quality related to short-term construction activities and long-term operations would not be avoided by this alternative.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, no land use incompatibilities would occur under Alternative 2 since the regional shopping center use would be continued. With regard to policy compliance, Alternative 2 would be consistent with the Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Noise Element, Housing Element, Public Safety Element and Arts Element of the General Plan, similar to the proposed project. Alternative 2 would be consistent with the Regional Commercial designation in the Carlsbad Zoning Ordinance; however, the proposed SP would implement deviations in the areas of building height, parking, landscaping and signage, similar to the proposed project. The long-term aesthetic effects of the variances would be beneficial as they would allow the applicant to update and improve the visual interest of the shopping center similar to the proposed project (although minimal improvements would occur within the El Camino Real corridor within 300 feet of the road). No conflicts with the Growth Management Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance and the Local Facilities Management Plan would occur (similar to the proposed project). As noted above under *Aesthetics*, the reconstruction of the department store and installation of new landscaping around the exterior of the building would indirectly enhance the corridor's scenic qualities, which is consistent with the El Camino Real Corridor Development Standards.

Noise

Construction noise, including general equipment and demolition sources, would be produced under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, construction noise would be intermittent and only occur during the hours and days specified in the Carlsbad Municipal Code, no significant impacts would be avoided by Alternative 2. Transportation noise would be less than under proposed conditions because less traffic would be produced by Alternative 2. Less than significant transportation noise impacts would occur under this alternative since none are identified for the proposed project.

Paleontological Resources

Potential project impacts to sensitive fossil resources contained in the on-site geologic formations would be lessened under Alternative 2, but not avoided since grading would occur in association with the main mall renovations. Potentially significant impacts would still be expected under Alternative 2 and monitoring would be required.

Transportation/Traffic

With the reduction of commercial gross leasable area (GLA) from levels proposed, Alternative 2 would reduce the net increase in ADT to 319 trips (as compared to 1,240 net ADT associated with the proposed project). Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not result in significant direct impacts to intersections or street segments in the vicinity of the shopping center in the Existing Plus Project, Near-Term or Horizon Year conditions. It would, however, still contribute to indirect cumulative impacts to three street segments in the City of Oceanside, since they are predicted to operate at LOS D or worse in the future without the proposed project. This cumulative impact would be mitigated under this alternative through payment of the same fair-share fee to be imposed on the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems

An incremental decrease in demand for utilities or service systems would occur under Alternative 2 since 26,300 less sf of commercial space would be constructed on site, as compared to the proposed project. The expanded shopping center would increase existing demand for potable water and would produce more sewage during dry weather and peak wet weather conditions than current levels. Storm drain facilities would continue to convey runoff off site and into the floodway for Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon. The amount of solid waste currently produced on site would increase, which would be collected by Waste Management and disposed of at the Otay and Sycamore Landfills. No existing infrastructure inadequacies are identified in the project area; therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts, similar to the proposed project.

6.2.3 Conclusion

Under Alternative 2, potentially significant impacts to cultural resources, geologic hazards, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials and paleontological resources on site would be similar to but slightly less than anticipated with the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, less than significant impacts would occur for air quality, aesthetics, energy, land use and planning, noise, and utilities/service systems for this alternative. The additional traffic associated with new commercial space would not result in significant direct impacts but would contribute to indirect cumulative impacts to three roadway segments in the City of Oceanside in the future. In all cases, the same mitigation required of the proposed project would address the impacts anticipated under this alternative. Alternative 2 would meet some of the basic project objectives outlined in Section 3.0 of this report. Specifically, this alternative would

modernize and expand the shopping center into a contemporary facility. New standards for landscaping, parking, uses, signage and building design would be implemented under the SP. New outdoor gathering places would be created along the edge of the main mall; however, the pedestrian-friendly gateways between the outer edges of the center and the mall would not be implemented since the out-buildings would not be constructed at this time. Fewer construction and commercial jobs and shopping opportunities, and a reduced sales tax base, would be generated by Alternative 2 since 26,300 less sf of commercial space would be constructed on site. Extensive sustainability measures would be integrated into the design, thus reducing existing energy and GHG emissions, similar to the proposed project. Improvements in long-term water quality would be realized since treatment control measures would be constructed.

6.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 – REDUCED PROJECT: RE-TENANT MAIN MALL PLUS OUT-BUILDINGS

6.3.1 Description of Alternative

In the case of Alternative 3, instead of fully reconstructing and substantially renovating the former Robinsons-May department store and adjacent retail shops, the spaces would undergo tenant improvements and be re-tenanted and the three new out-buildings would be constructed. Based on this description, this alternative would result in 225,631 sf of the main mall being re-occupied (after internal tenant improvements are implemented) and 26,300 sf of new commercial space being constructed where the three out-buildings are proposed. Therefore, the net increase would be 26,300 sf under Alternative 3 (in contrast to the 35,417 sf under the proposed project) and the expanded shopping center would encompass 1,177,392 sf GLA (or 9,117 sf less than the proposed project) under this alternative. The Westfield Carlsbad SP would still be implemented under this alternative. The development standards, design criteria and guidelines and implementation procedures contained in the SP would be adopted. Similar to the proposed project, future SDPs would have to comply with the provisions and procedures in the SP.

6.3.2 Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternative to Proposed Project

Aesthetics

The main mall and adjacent retail shops would be re-tenanted and the outer perimeter of the shopping center site would feature new out-buildings. Some of the architecture and landscape treatments proposed as part of the current SDP proposal would be implemented as proposed, although the main mall would remain interior-focused and not feature externally-oriented retail

space. Views from properties fronting and east of El Camino Real would feature externally-focused outer structures, with the main mall in the background. In addition, new signage and landscaping would be implemented along the El Camino Real corridor. Site improvements within 300 feet of the corridor would enhance its scenic qualities by improving the look of the shopping center from the adjacent road and softening views of the parking areas. Similar to the proposed project, no scenic resources would be affected by this alternative. The long-term aesthetic benefits to visual character and quality of implementing comprehensive development regulations and design guidelines would be realized immediately under Alternative 3. Potential increases in light and glare associated with new sources of night lighting, such as parking lot standards, would occur, although impacts would not be significant, similar to the proposed project. Less than significant aesthetic impacts would occur under Alternative 3, similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Under Alternative 3, new construction emissions would be produced from the construction of the three out-buildings and interior renovations of the former Robinsons-May department store and adjacent retail space. Short-term increases in criteria pollutants emissions associated with project construction phases, including demolition, new construction and paving, would still occur but be less than under the proposed project since the main mall structure would not be demolished. A decrease in long-term operational emissions related to natural gas combustion, landscaping, architectural coating and vehicles, would occur compared to the proposed project, as less new GLA would be constructed on site under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, a violation of the CO standards, resulting in a CO hotspot near local intersections would not occur. Because the proposed project would not exceed stated significance thresholds, significant air pollutant emissions impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be even less and no significant impacts would occur, although incremental contributions to cumulative emissions would be avoided.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 3 would lessen the potentially significant impact of the proposed project caused by the disturbance of buried (but unknown) cultural resources, as minimal grading would be required to install the three out-building pads. Should resources exist beneath the other developed portions of the site, they would stay intact and would not be disturbed as much less grading would occur under this alternative. Mitigation related to construction monitoring would

still be required under Alternative 3. Therefore, this alternative would not result in potential impacts to cultural resources and no mitigation would be required.

Energy

Energy demands associated with Alternative 3 would be less than the proposed project since nearly 9,117 sf less commercial space would be developed. Less enhancements in the energy efficiencies would be realized under this alternative, compared to the proposed conditions, since interior renovations would not be required to comply with 2008 Title 24 or the CALGreen building standards under Alternative 3. The amount of construction-related energy usage would be reduced compared to the proposed project since less extensive renovations would be implemented on the main mall. Less than significant impacts to energy would arise under Alternative 3, similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

The potential for impacts from geologic hazards, such as seismic-induced ground rupture, ground shaking, or liquefaction/settlement would be similar as for the proposed project. Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of new construction but would not avoid potentially significant project impacts due to seismically-induced ground shaking and liquefaction/settlement, as well as compressible/expansive soils, shallow groundwater, oversize materials and foundation/footing design issues.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under Alternative 3, GHG emissions would be produced during the construction phase but would be less than anticipated under the proposed project. An increase in long-term GHG emissions would be related to electricity, natural gas, water consumption and vehicles. Renovations conducted on the existing mall structure to re-tenant those spaces would not be required to comply with Title 24 and CALGreen conservation standards; therefore, the GHG reductions would not reach the same level of conservation as a new, more efficient structure. Regulatory reductions in vehicular GHGs would naturally occur as emissions reductions are realized by fuel efficiency standards promulgated by the state and federal governments. Thus, although Alternative 3 would increase existing GHGs produced on site, no significant contributions to cumulative GHG emissions would occur in the future.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials

Tenant improvements within the main mall would likely result in the disturbance of some ACM and/or LBP, but less than under the proposed project which would be a more extensive renovation including removal of the existing roof. Therefore, this potentially significant impact would be less than the proposed project but would still occur under the Alternative 3. Mitigation identified for the proposed project would be applied under this alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Westfield Carlsbad shopping center would continue to contribute runoff to the Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon watershed and the Pacific Ocean. Similar to the proposed project, existing drainage patterns and directions would remain unchanged. A net decrease in impervious surfaces (and runoff) would be achieved through the proposed installation of pervious pavement and landscaping similar to the proposed project. Potential short-term construction impacts to water quality related to erosion/siltation and other sources of degradation would occur under Alternative 3, although less new construction would reduce the impact as compared to the proposed project. Urban contaminants would continue to accumulate in the parking areas and drainage facilities and be transported off site. Some improvement to long-term water quality would be realized under this alternative because treatment control BMPs and LID improvements, such as bio-swales, irrigation controls and pervious pavement, would be implemented on site. Potentially significant impacts to water quality related to short-term construction activities and long-term operations would not be avoided by this alternative.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, no land use incompatibilities would occur under Alternative 3 since the regional shopping center use would be continued. With regard to policy compliance, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Noise Element, Housing Element, Public Safety Element and Arts Element of the General Plan, similar to the proposed project. Alternative 3 would be consistent with the Regional Commercial designation in the Carlsbad Zoning Ordinance; however, the proposed SP would implement deviations in the areas of building height, parking, landscaping and signage. The long-term aesthetic effects of the deviations would be beneficial as they would allow the applicant to update and improve the visual interest of the shopping center similar to the proposed project. No conflicts with the Growth Management Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance and the Local Facilities Management Plan would occur (similar to the proposed project). As noted above under

Aesthetics, the renovation of the department store, construction of the new out-buildings, and installation of new landscaping would indirectly enhance the corridor's scenic qualities, which is consistent with the El Camino Real Corridor Development Standards.

Noise

Construction noise, related to general equipment and demolition sources, would be produced under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, construction noise would be intermittent and only occur during the hours and days specified in the Carlsbad Municipal Code; as such, similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts would occur under Alternative 3. New noise sources would be produced by Alternative 3 in the form of new HVAC equipment atop the roofs of the out-buildings. Similar to the proposed project, less than significant noise impacts would be produced by the equipment. Transportation noise would be less than under proposed conditions because less traffic would be produced by Alternative 3. Less than significant transportation noise impacts would occur under this alternative, similar to the proposed project.

Paleontological Resources

Potential project impacts to sensitive fossil resources contained in the on-site geologic formations would be lessened under Alternative 3, but not avoided since new construction would occur on site. Potentially significant impacts would still be expected under Alternative 3 and monitoring would be required.

Transportation/Traffic

With the 9,117-sf reduction in new construction from proposed levels, Alternative 3 would reduce the net increase in ADT to 920 trips (as compared to 1,240 ADT associated with the proposed project). Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not result in significant direct impacts to intersections or street segments in the vicinity of the shopping center in the Existing Plus Project, Near-Term or Horizon Year conditions. Traffic produced by Alternative 3 would, however, still contribute to indirect cumulative impacts to three street segments in the City of Oceanside since they are predicted to operate at LOS D or worse in the future without the proposed project. Thus, cumulatively significant impacts would still occur under this alternative. This cumulative impact would be mitigated through payment of the same fair-share fee to be imposed on the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems

An incremental decrease in demand for utilities or service systems would occur under the Alternative 3 since 9,117 sf less commercial space would be constructed on site, as compared to the proposed project. The expanded shopping center would increase existing demand for potable water and would produce more sewage during dry weather and peak wet weather conditions. Storm drain facilities would continue to convey runoff off site and into the floodway for Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon. The amount of solid waste produced on site would increase, which would be collected by Waste Management and disposed of at the Otay and Sycamore Landfills. As there are no existing infrastructure inadequacies identified in the project area, less than significant impacts would occur under this alternative, similar to the proposed project.

6.3.3 Conclusion

Under Alternative 3, potentially significant impacts to cultural resources, geologic hazards, hydrology and water quality, and paleontological resources would be similar to but slightly less than anticipated with the proposed project. However, the impacts would be mitigated through the same measures recommended for the proposed project. The additional traffic associated with new construction would not result in significant direct impacts but would contribute to indirect cumulative impacts to three roadway segments in the City of Oceanside in the future. Similar to the proposed project, less than significant impacts would occur for air quality, aesthetics, energy, land use and planning, noise, and utilities/service systems for this alternative. Alternative 3 would meet most of the basic project objectives outlined in Section 3.0 of this report, but not to the same extent as the proposed project. Specifically, this alternative would modernize and expand the shopping center into a contemporary facility. New standards for landscaping, parking, uses, signage and building design would be implemented under the SP. Pedestrian-friendly gateways between the outer edges of the center and the mall would be implemented along with the out-buildings. Fewer construction and commercial jobs and shopping opportunities, and a reduced sales tax base, would be generated by Alternative 3 since 9,117 less sf of commercial space would be constructed on site. With the out-buildings and other SDP improvements in place, an improved street presence would be realized, including an enhanced streetscape for El Camino Real, a visual “gateway” into the City. Sustainability measures would be integrated into the project, but not necessarily to levels anticipated under the proposed project. Improvements in long-term water quality would be realized since treatment control measures would be constructed.

6.4 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Table 6-1, *Summary Analysis for Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, compares the significance of the potential impacts for the proposed project with the impacts for each of the alternatives considered in detail. The project alternatives discussed in this section reduce one or more potentially significant environmental impacts anticipated as a result of the proposed project. However, after the imposition of mitigation measures, all of the proposed project's environmental effects would be reduced to a level below significance. Similarly, the environmental effects of each of the alternatives would be less than significant after imposition of similar mitigation measures.

Table 6-1
SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Issue	Proposed Project Without Mitigation	Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative	Alternative 2 - Reduced Project: Main Mall Renovations Only	Alternative 3 - Reduced Project: Re-tenant Main Mall Plus Out-Buildings
Aesthetics	LS	■	■	—
Air Quality	LS	■	■	■
Cultural Resources	PS	■	▼	▼
Geology and Soils	PS	■	▼	—
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LS	■	■	▲
Hazards/Hazardous Materials	PS	▼	▼	▼
Hydrology and Water Quality	PS	■	▼	—
Land Use and Planning	LS	▲	▲	—
Noise	PS	■	■	—
Paleontological Resources	PS	■	▼	—
Transportation/ Traffic	PS	■	▼	—
Utilities and Service Systems	LS	■	■	—

Notes:

PS=Potentially significant; LS=Less than significant; N=No impact; SU=Potentially significant and unavoidable

▲=Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to proposed project

—=Alternative is likely to result in similar impacts to issue when compared to proposed project

▼=Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed project, however, impacts would still be significant before mitigation

■=Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed project and impacts would likely be less than significant and not require mitigation

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Although the No Project Alternative could result in minimal environmental impacts, the State CEQA Guidelines require identification of an alternative other than the No Project Alternative as Environmentally Superior. Based upon the discussion above, Alternative 2 would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative for its ability to reduce many of the identified project impacts while achieving some of the project objectives. Alternative 2 would reduce the project impacts more than Alternative 3 (as shown in Table 6-1), given that it would result in a larger reduction in commercial space than the other alternatives and would involve less new construction. As discussed above, significant impacts to geologic hazards, hydrology and water quality, and paleontological resources on site would be similar to but slightly less under Alternative 2 than anticipated with the proposed project. The additional traffic associated with new construction would not result in significant direct impacts but would contribute to indirect cumulative impacts to three roadway segments in the City of Oceanside in the future. Note, however, that this alternative would achieve some but not all of the basic objectives established for the proposed project, since it would not enhance pedestrian connections between uses and would not improve the streetscape fronting the shopping center, including the El Camino Real corridor. Alternative 2 would revitalize the existing shopping center, but less commercial space would be constructed and the amount and range of new commercial uses would be reduced. In addition, less construction and commercial employment opportunities would be produced and the sales tax base would be lower for Alternative 2.